

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Currently, claims 20-61 are pending in this application.

Second Request to Acknowledge Applicant's Claim for Foreign Priority and Receipt of Priority Documents:

The present application is a national phase filing of international application no. PCT/GB99/01661 designating the U.S. and claims priority from foreign application nos. GB 9811267.5 filed on May 26, 1998 and EP 98304144.3 filed on May 26, 1998. Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of the claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119 and receipt of certified copies of the priority documents.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103:

Claims 20-26, 30-31, 40-42 and 48-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yates et al (U.S. '586, hereinafter "Yates"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 20 and its dependents require "for each type of said differing types of service, said session manager is arranged during a service session in which a plurality of participants participate, to generate an event message in response to a change of a session-related status of an individual participant in the session, wherein a service-session event handler receives a logically uncombined event transmitted in an event message generated in response to each change in the session-related status of at least some of said plurality of participants without any historical data."

Independent claims 40, 42 and 49 require, *inter alia*, generating logically uncombined events from at least some of a plurality of participants in a service-session.

The claimed feature “logically uncombined events” is supported by, for example, page 18, line 12 to page 20 of the specification which states the following:

“It is a characteristic of the event messages transmitted to the event handler 31 that the events detailed in the event messages contain no history data. In other words, the events are not logically combined, and each message concerns only an instantaneous event which has just occurred in the session. This is to be compared with other known ways of generating events, which generally include calculating a duration, by referring to historical usage start date/time on receiving a usage stop date/time. By the events transmitted to the event handler not being logically combined, the flexibility of processing which may be subsequently applied to the events is maintained at a high level (emphasis added).”

Related description of logically uncombined events can be found, for example, on page 2, lines 6-13 which states the following:

“In this regard, chargeable events, other than subscription-type events, have in the past been generated not as a record of an instantaneous event, but as what as may be referred to as a ‘combined’ event, generated when instantaneous events are logically combined. For example, in conventional telephony, a chargeable event is recorded in a call record, which specifies the duration of the call by means of both a start time and an end time. In this sense, the chargeable event recorded in the call record is a ‘combined’ event, consisting of data specifying more than one instantaneous event.”

Nothing in Yates discloses or even suggests logically uncombined events from a plurality (“at least some”) of the participants in a service-session. Yates discloses a multi-user session in which a plurality of users may participate. However, the multi-user

sessions are assumed to be billed to the party which initiates the user session and invites other parties to participate (col. 13, line 1 to col. 14, line 13 and Figs. 10-11). Yates thus discloses recording the duration of a call between one party and another party so that the total charge can be added to the instigating party's billing records. This is consistent with conventional billing practice.

The present invention relates to processing logically uncombined events from a plurality of participants in a service-session. Yates fails to teach or suggest this feature. Conventionally, a billing record for a particular participant in a user session will be generated only once the actual "call" or "session" is over for that participant. Each party in the multi-party call performed in the Yates system could not be billed until the call is completed, and each party would be billed only for their participation regardless of the number of participants or how long those other participants participated.

Yates therefore does not even consider exemplary environments such as a gaming environment where a plurality of participants made independently of each other join or leave a game. (Contrast with the example discussed on page 23, lines 1-12 of the specification). Yates explicitly discloses that participation is by invitation of the originator of the multi-user session. In an environment where it is possible for users to independently join and leave a session, it is useful if information regarding the participant's activities can be recorded in such a way that each participant's event handler is aware of the other events generated by the other participants. Accordingly, each participant may be billed for their part in a session that is still ongoing based on the

number of participants who were simultaneously participating in the session, regardless of whether the last participant has left the session or not. Yates fails to even contemplate such an environment.

Yates discloses in col. 14, lines 15-47 that when complex options (e.g., video conferencing) are selected, one user may have more privileges than another user. However, other than this teaching, Yates merely discloses the generation of billing information for a specific end-user's usage context (col. 19, lines 35-57). This does not teach, suggest or imply that events are reported in a logically uncombined manner without historical data.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 20-26, 30-31, 40-42 and 48-49 are not anticipated by Yates and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 32-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by "TINA Consortium - Network Resource Architecture Version 3.0" (hereinafter "TINA"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claims 32, 34 and 36 and their respective dependents require logically uncombined events indicating respective changes in the respective session-related statuses of at least some of a plurality of participants in a service-session. TINA fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation.

In TINA, accounting events are described in the context of communicating event data to an event handler (see page 7-142, section 7.3 stating "accounting events can be

understood as a common call record. When events are logged in a central server, they are in fact equivalent to call records.”). This is consistent with the manner in which network level call records are conventionally handled. The Federal Standard 1027C (Telecommunications: Glossary of Telecommunications Terms), is defined as follows “Call Record: recorded data pertaining to a single call.” Glossary at 188. Federal Standard 1027C defines a call in several contexts. However, the relevant context in this case is “operations required to establish, maintain and release a connection.”

Otherwise, in the TINA architecture, accounting events are forwarded to a metering monitor at the network resource level (which is not a service-session level event handler). Nothing in TINA discloses logically uncombined events originating from a plurality of participants in a service-session.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 32-39 are not anticipated by TINA and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

Claims 27, 28, 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yates in view of Lynch-Aired (U.S. ‘402). Claims 29 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yates in view of Ginzboorg et al (U.S. ‘051, hereinafter “Ginzboorg”). Claim 47 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yates in view of TINA. None of Lynch-Aired, Ginzboorg and/or TINA remedy the above described deficiencies of Yates. Accordingly, even if these references were combined with Yates as proposed by the

ELLIS et al.
Application No. 09/674,073
November 8, 2004

Office Action, the combination would not have rendered the claimed invention obvious.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

New Claims:

New claims 51-61 have been added to provide additional protection for the invention. Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to their respective base claims.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Raymond Y. Mah
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:sl
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4044
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100